

## VSP Public Comment

---

**From:** Lenox [klenox@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 23, 2005 6:07 PM  
**To:** McDannold, Bruce  
**Subject:** public comment for the VotingSystems and Procedures Panel

Dear Mr. McDonald:

I understand that the Secraetary of State is considering certifying Diebold Voting machines and ES&S tabulation machines for use in California. I'm writing to to to urge Secretary of State McPherson not to approve their adoption.

The so-called AVVPAT technology being submitted by Diebold for certification is a inefficient and uneconomical. The thermal paper and miniature type will make a cost-effective hand count impossible. Diebold will have to be paid additional sums to do such hand counts. Predictably, these will be costly.

We need Accessible Voter Verified Paper Ballots that provide an auditable trail by being printed on archival paper in readable font on separate sheets for each ballot. These ballots or audit trails should be capable of being handled and read by vote counters hired and trained by the Counties. The ballots/audit trails must preserve voter confidentiality. They must not be issued as a continued paper roll in which the order of voting is obvious and privacy compromised.

Both the Diebold System and the E S &S Tabulators operate on Proprietary Closed Source Code Software. Their tabulating processes are so secretive and hidden from public scrutiny and observation as to make the verification and observation process hidden and non-transparent to the Voter. Ballot counting should not be in the hands of private companies.

Voting systems with wireless and Internet capabilities MUST be denied as they compromise the entire integrity, secrecy, and security of the voting process. Any knowledgeable hacker with a good encryption cracking program can access and corrupt and alter the voting data in a matter of minutes. The E S & S tabulators have a Dell Laptop which contains wireless capabilities.

**Further, BAN DIEBOLD From Doing Business in California for 3 years**, by enforcing California Election Code Section 19214.5, subsection (a) and (3) which penalize voting companies that sell and install uncertified software.

(Assoc. Press) "Diebold paid \$2.6 million to settle a lawsuit filed by California alleging that the electronic voting company sold the state and several counties shoddy voting equipment." (Mercury News) "State auditors reported that voters in 17 California counties cast ballots in recent elections using software that had not been certified by the state. Voters in Los Angeles County and two smaller counties voted on machines installed with software that was not approved by the Federal Election Commission."

In conclusion, please require a paper trail that will ensure ballots are counted as cast, oppose wireless capabilities for e-voting systems, promote open source software, and ban Diebold from doing business in California for three years.

Sincerely,

07/11/2005

Kate Lenox  
4823 C St.  
Sacramento, CA 95819